

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, and 15-18, as amended, remain herein. Claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 11-14 have been canceled. New claims 15-18 have been added. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, in original claims 2, 4-7, 9 and 13, and in Fig. 1 and the accompanying description in the specification at p. 19, line 26—p. 20, line 19.

This Amendment is believed to place this application fully in condition for allowance, and surely in better condition for any appeal. Thus, entry of this Amendment and allowance of all claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, and 15-18 are respectfully requested.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging that claims 4, 5, 7-9, 10 and 13 contain allowable subject matter. New claim 15 contains the subject matter of claims 1 and 4. New claim 16 contains the subject matter of claims 1, 2, 6 and 7. New claim 17 contains the subject matter of claims 1 and 9. New claim 18 contains the subject matter of claims 1 and 13.

1. Fig. 8 has been amended, mooting the objection thereto.
2. Claims 1, 3 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). Claim 11 has been canceled, mooting the rejection thereof. In addition, AAPA fails to disclose a first factor computation device directly connected to the equalization target value generation device, as recited in applicant's amended claim 1. As disclosed in applicant's specification, p. 19, lines 26-35, applicant's adaptive equalization circuit does not require the rate converter as in AAPA, thereby decreasing circuit scale and increasing

computing accuracy. Since AAPA fails to disclose every element of applicant's claim 1, AAPA is an inadequate basis for rejecting claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

3. Claims 2, 6 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over AAPA and Miyashita U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0067677. Claim 12 has been canceled, mooted the rejection thereof. As discussed above, AAPA fails to disclose every element of applicant's claim 1, from which claims 2 and 6 depend. Miyashita fails to disclose what AAPA lacks. Nor would it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify or combine AAPA and Miyashita to disclose every element of applicant's claims 1, 2 and 6. Neither AAPA nor Miyashita contain any teaching that would have motivated one of ordinary skill to modify either AAPA, Miyashita, or a combination thereof, to render applicant's claims obvious. For the foregoing reasons, AAPA and Miyashita are inadequate grounds for rejecting claims 2 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

4. Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over AAPA and Rakib U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0156603. Claim 14 has been canceled, mooted the rejection thereof.

Accordingly, all claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, and 15-18 are now fully in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The PTO is hereby authorized to charge/credit any fee deficiencies or overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-4293. If further amendments would place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP

Date: January 30, 2009



Roger W. Parkhurst

Reg. No. 25,177

Adam C. Ellsworth

Reg. No. 55,152

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-1795
Tel: (202) 429-3000
Fax: (202) 429-3902

Attorney Docket No.: 28951.5391